



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/075,670	02/13/2002	Peter Eisele	A-3172	2676

24131 7590 03/23/2006

LERNER GREENBERG STEMER LLP
P O BOX 2480
HOLLYWOOD, FL 33022-2480

EXAMINER

RAHIMI, IRAJ A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2625

DATE MAILED: 03/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/075,670

Applicant(s)

EISELE, PETER

Examiner

(Iraj) Alan Rahimi

Art Unit

2622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 December 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 February 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5/10/2002</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. In papers filed on December 30, 2005 applicant added claim 9. Examiner appreciates receiving a copy of oath. In response to the missing English translation of abstract for the non patent literature, applicant provided a summary of the non-patent literature in English. Attached is a signed copy of the IDS.

Examiner also noted the change in specification for defining DMA to be Direct Memory Access.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 7 have been considered but are not persuasive. Applicant should note that claims are written very broadly and examiner interprets them with the broadest meaning appropriate.

Applicant attempts to associate the raster data with the raster memory and alleges that Notredame does not disclose a raster image processing system. Examiner disagrees and points to Fig. 10 of Notredame for showing the raster image processor system (RIP 1009) and column 10, lines 15-20 which states that RIP 1009 can be either part of the prepress work station 1005 or rapid merge system 1003. Therefore when RIP 1009 is part of rapid merge system 1003, cache 1011 which is part of the rapid merge system 1003, can be associated with RIP system. As noted in the previous action, examiner referred to the page element cache 1011 as the raster memory. With the above teaching of Notredame, the raster data from RIP system 1009 can be stored in cache 1011 or the so called raster memory. Examiner considers cache 1011 as a raster memory when RIP system 1009 and rapid merge system 1003 are housed together.

Art Unit: 2622

Applicant also attempts to add other limitations in the claim language by asserting subjects that are not claimed. For instance applicant argues over data being uncompressed where there is not limitation in the claims for uncompressed data.

Applicant argues that Notredame does not show raster processor storing raster data column by column. Notredame discloses this limitation in column 35, lines 49-67.

Applicant argues that Agarwal (US patent application publication 2001/0022815) is not prior art by referring to its filing date. Examiner points out that this application is a continuation of another application which provides priority back to May 26, 1995, making this reference a valid prior art.

Examiner considers a printing device as an image setting device.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1 and 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Notredame et al. (US patent 6,049,390).

Regarding claim 1, Notredame discloses a raster generation system for image-setting unit, comprising:

a printing machine with an at least one raster processor for generating raster data from raw image data (Fig. 10, RIP system 1009); and

Art Unit: 2622

a memory for storing the raster data, said memory formed by a raster memory with random access (page element cache 1011);

said raster processor storing the raster data column by column in said raster memory (column 35, lines 48-67).

Regarding claim 7, Notredame discloses a method of processing raster data for an image-setting unit of a printing machine, which comprises:

generating raster data line by line from raw image data (column 35, lines 48-67);

storing the raster data column by column in a raster memory with random access (column 35, lines 48-67); and

reading out the raster data column by column into an image-setting unit (printing device 1019).

Regarding claim 8, Notredame discloses the method according to claim 7, which comprises:

using a DMA controller (processor 112) to control the step of reading out the raster data; and

buffering the raster data that has been read out in a buffer memory (page element store 1013).

Regarding claim 9, Notredame discloses the raster generation system according to claim 1, wherein the raster data are generated line by line from raw mage data (column 35, lines 49-67). A line of image data is considered same as a row of image data.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 2-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Notredame et al. (US patent 6049390) in view of Agarwal (US patent application publication 2001/0022815).

Regarding claims 2 and 6, Notredame et al. does not discloses the raster generation system according to claim 1, comprising a first plug-in interface board, said raster memory and said raster processor disposed on said first plug-in interface board.

Agarwall discloses in paragraph 36 a pixel processor 106 (same as raster processor) and memory device 112 on a plug-in board.

Notredame and Agarwall are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor that is image reproduction.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person ordinary skill in the art to have the memory and processor on a plug-in board.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to make the expansion and repair of the image device quicker.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Notredame and Agarwall to obtain the invention as specified in claim 2.

Regarding claim 3, Notredame discloses the raster generation system according to claim 2, comprising:

an image-setting unit (printing device 1019); and
a DMA controller (processor 112) for controlling a transfer of raster data the from said raster memory to said image-setting unit .

Regarding claim 4, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 3, are presented.

Regarding claim 5, Notredame discloses the raster generation system according to claim 4, comprising:

a buffer memory page element 1013;
said DMA controller (processor 112) providing an output;
said buffer memory buffering said output of said DMA controller (Fig. 10).

Conclusion

7. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 2622


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


Contact Information

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to (Iraj) Alan Rahimi whose telephone number is 571-272-7411. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 8:00 - 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward L Coles can be reached on 571-272-7402. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2600.


Alan Rahimi
March 13, 2006


DAVID MOORE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600